

what my "modern textbook on assessment tells its beginning students" (Kleinmuntz, 1982, p. 333). I trust that the remainder of their article is factually more honest than their handling of my material. Evidently, in their enthusiasm to support their main thesis that nonpsychologists as well as psychologists are indignant toward tests for their alleged role in promoting a restrictive immigration policy, the authors managed to omit and twist a fact here and there in the preliminaries to their thesis. They characterize me as being among those indignant psychologists and nonpsychologists who have fallen for Kamin's naive reading of the history and politics of intelligence testing and its influence on the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act.

In point of fact, I raised the same counter-Kamin argument as they when I suggested on page 330 of my book that "[Kamin's] view was not shared by Franz Samelson (1975) . . . who . . . questioned the importance of psychological testing in shaping the social and political climates." And, again, several pages later, on pages 333 to 335, I issued a caveat against buying Kamin's (1973, 1974) argument by indicating that "if the tests fall short of the standards of psychometric excellence . . . it is important to ask what the alternatives to intelligence testing are . . . admittedly most of the alternatives are not satisfactory."

What else can I tell my beginning students? I do tell them, of course, to read Samelson's article, which is an incisive and honest analysis of the same topic written 10 years ago. I wonder if Snyderman and Herrnstein knew of that article. They certainly did not cite it.

## REFERENCES

- Kamin, L. J. (1973). *Heredity, intelligence, politics, and psychology*. Unpublished manuscript, Princeton University.
- Kamin, L. J. (1974). *The science and politics of IQ*. Potomac, MD: Erlbaum.
- Kleinmuntz, B. (1982). *Personality and psychological assessment*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Samelson, F. (1975). On the science and the politics of the IQ. *Social Research: An International Quarterly of the Social Sciences*, 42, 466-488.
- Snyderman, M., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1983). Intelligence tests and the Immigration Act of 1924. *American Psychologist*, 38, 986-995.

## Is Anybody Listening?

Mark Snyderman  
R. J. Herrnstein  
Harvard University

We welcome the opportunity to apologize to Samelson for not recognizing his precedence in many of the points raised in our article. We, indeed, should have been expected to know of his work, and we hope that the publication of these comments will redress the balance to some extent. Our obvious shortcomings notwithstanding, there seem to be at least two good reasons for having published our article (Snyderman & Herrnstein, 1983). First, the very fact that none of the five anonymous reviewers for the *American Psychologist* mentioned Samelson's work in their reviews is presumptive evidence that his findings bear repetition. Three of the reviewers identified themselves as historians, which suggests that Sokal's (this issue, p. 241) optimism about the benefits of historical professionalism may be unfounded. More widely read, and more recent, sources than Samelson's study (e.g., Gould, 1981; Kleinmuntz, 1982; Nairn, 1980) present largely unchallenged versions of Kamin's (1974) history. Ironically, Samelson (1975) himself, in the article most relevant to ours, offered a plausible explanation for why people have missed his own contributions to the subject. He suggested that an article by Kamin, published in the same journal, may have been overlooked by psychologists because it "did not appear in the psychological *Fachliteratur*" (p. 469).

Second, although our article lacked the breadth of topics discussed in Samelson's articles on the social and political context of the early mental testing movement, it contained a more detailed analysis of the particular issues with which we were concerned. Samelson's (1975, 1979, 1982) discussions of the consensus, or lack thereof, among psychologists concerning the relevance of test scores to immigration policy, and the role, if any, of these scores in the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, resembled ours but were sketchier. On scholarly grounds alone, a more comprehensive survey was in order, and we are not at all certain that even our more comprehensive one took the chore as far as it needs to go. In any

event, as embarrassed as we were to discover Samelson's publications after the fact, it was reassuring to find that the same conclusions had been reached by two independent investigations.

Given the apparent agreement between ourselves and Samelson, his comment (this issue, p. 243) is puzzling. Samelson's statement about our failure to engage, rather than accept, earlier interpretations, and his warning not merely to accept "what everybody knows," implies that we approached our work intending to restate uncritically the consensus opinion, presumably his own. Disregarding the obvious contradiction between our ignorance of Samelson's articles and their being "what everybody knows," we did not, as McPherson (this issue, p. 242) also seems to imply, conduct our research by "scanning sources looking for one, or even a few quotes supporting our initial position" (p. 242). If anything, our initial position was the opposite of our final conclusions. Our article was an outgrowth of an attempt to sort out the issues in a series of comments in the *American Psychologist* (Dorfman, 1982; Gersh, 1982; Herrnstein, 1981; Kamin, 1982) concerning Goddard's (1917) paper. Samelson (1982) published a clarification in this journal just as our article was being submitted. Discovering Kamin's misrepresentation of Goddard prompted us to investigate further his claims about intelligence testing and immigration. The racism evident in both Brigham's (1923) book and the Immigration Act itself made it seem, a priori, as if Kamin was probably more nearly correct than not. Only the evidence, as we uncovered it, led us to believe otherwise. If our arguments seem at times overstated, it is precisely because of the overstatements made by the "other side."

Why, then, is Samelson so bothered by our "tortured conclusions" when they are virtually identical to his own, as Sokal (this issue, p. 241) properly notes? Samelson criticizes us for not citing Garis (1927), but he himself had concluded that "it is hard to find any concrete evidence supporting Garis's and Kamin's assessment" (Samelson, 1975, p. 472) of the role of the army tests. Garis was, as he says, no "modern ideologue" (this issue, p. 243). He was a contemporary ideologue trying to legitimize

the 1924 Act by associating it with intelligence tests, the mirror image, in other words, of Kamin and Gould trying to indict the tests by similarly associating tests and the Act. We are chastized for ending our article where the problem starts. In addition to demonstrating that intelligence testing had little impact on immigration policy, we should have attempted to explain this lack of influence. We should also have addressed the larger issues of how one goes about assessing the impact of "scientific" results on legislation, and why a "paradigm shift" had occurred in psychology by 1935. Although these are important questions, they are beyond the scope of our article, which was an attempt to assess the validity of the two particular claims that had been made about the relation between early mental testing and immigration, namely, that the testing movement supported the 1924 law and that the legislators relied significantly on test data. We did not deal with topics outside this focus, nor do we feel we have misled anyone as to what the answers to further questions might be. If others find our article incomplete or inconsequential because of these omissions, so be it. In the meantime, we have come across no evidence that would cause us to alter our conclusions, nor do the comments on our article in this issue offer any. The testing community was divided on the legislation, and the legislators were, to a truly remarkable degree considering the conventional wisdom on the subject, indifferent to the data of testing.

Ford (this issue, p. 244) criticizes us for neglecting the widespread belief in biological determinism and other racist doctrines among early mental testers. But we were concerned not with the general belief (if that is what it was) in biological determinism, nor in racist and sexist hiring policies, but in how testing influenced immigration policy, as it is almost universally charged with having done. Moreover, if Ford is right that racist or nativist views were common in the 1920s, it would lend further support to our claim that there was no causal connection between mental test scores and the Immigration Act of 1924. A majority of members of Congress favored the law, and it is likely that a majority of the American population did too. Does it make sense to blame

the testing community if some fraction of its membership (less than a majority, we would guess) were with the American consensus of the time?

Finally, we would like to address Kleinmuntz's comments (this issue, p. 244), even though he does not address ours. Kleinmuntz claims not to have uncritically accepted Kamin's history in his textbook, but the only reference we made to Kleinmuntz's (1982) book was his uncritical reporting of Goddard's numbers, which he took directly from Kamin. The Samelson article Kleinmuntz cited in his book as a disclaimer to Kamin did not mention Goddard's (1917) analysis. No one who read Kleinmuntz could doubt what his message to students was. After presenting Kamin's idiosyncratic version of Goddard, he added, "This view was not shared by Franz Samelson (1975), a philosopher and social science historian, who *did not dispute Kamin's facts* but questioned the importance of psychological testing in shaping the social and political climates" (p. 330, emphasis added). If those "facts" were intended to describe reality, Samelson certainly thought he was disputing them, and so are we. Shortly thereafter, Kleinmuntz summarized Kamin's history of intelligence testing and immigration, recommending to his readers that they read Kamin's "recounting of the sorry history of the uses and abuses of intelligence testing" (p. 347). Kleinmuntz's "caveat" about the alternatives to intelligence testing is, at best, irrelevant to the historical question; at worst, it more firmly implants a false impression. Given that Kleinmuntz presumably knew Samelson's work when he wrote his book, we doubt that our article will prompt him to revise the relevant passages. If it does not, and if his reaction is typical, our work may be destined to remain as unknown to people who "should be expected to know better" as that of Samelson.

#### REFERENCES

- Brigham, C. C. (1923). *A study of American intelligence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dorfman, D. D. (1982). Henry Goddard and the feeble-mindedness of Jews, Hungarians, Italians, and Russians. *American Psychologist*, 37, 96-97.
- Ford, C. A. (1985). Intelligence tests and the Immigration Act of 1924. *American Psychologist*, 40, 244.
- Garis, R. L. (1927). *Immigration restriction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gersh, D. (1982). Professor Herrnstein: Look before you leap. *American Psychologist*, 37, 97.
- Goddard, H. H. (1917). Mental tests and the immigrant. *The Journal of Delinquency*, 2, 243-277.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1981). Try again, Dr. Albee. *American Psychologist*, 36, 424-425.
- Kamin, L. J. (1974). *The science and politics of IQ*. Potomac, Md.: Erlbaum.
- Kamin, L. J. (1982). Mental testing and immigration. *American Psychologist*, 37, 97-98.
- Kleinmuntz, B. (1982). *Personality and psychological assessment*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kleinmuntz, B. (1985). Selective amnesia in search of truth. *American Psychologist*, 40, 244-245.
- McPherson, K. S. (1985). On intelligence testing and immigration legislation. *American Psychologist*, 40, 242-243.
- Nairn, A. (1980). *The reign of ETS: The corporation that makes up minds*. Washington, DC: Ralph Nader.
- Samelson, F. (1975). On the science and politics of the IQ. *Social Research*, 42, 467-488.
- Samelson, F. (1979). Putting psychology on the map: Ideology and intelligence testing. In A. R. Buss (Ed.), *Psychology in social context* (pp. 103-168). New York: Irvington.
- Samelson, F. (1982). H. H. Goddard and the immigrants. *American Psychologist*, 37, 1291.
- Samelson, F. (1985). Quotes, questions, and standards for historical research. *American Psychologist*, 40, 243-244.
- Sokal, M. M. (1985). APA publications and the history of psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 241-242.
- Snyderman, M., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1983). Intelligence tests and the Immigration Act of 1924. *American Psychologist*, 38, 986-995.

### Psychology 1984 and Six Years Before: A Content Analysis of the 86th and 92nd American Psychological Association Annual Conventions in Toronto, Canada

Marcia J. Scherer  
Graduate School of Education and Human Development and School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester

Six years in the history and development of a profession is such a short